

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant-Plaintiff, Wayne E. Sinn (Sinn), appeals the trial court's grant of summary judgment in favor of Appellees-Defendants, PEN Products, Nancy Broglin (Broglin), Lin Paul (Paul), Mary Balfour (Balfour), Tom Gosser (Gosser), R. Brett Jones (Jones), Angie Jackson (Jackson), and Cheryl Sexton (Sexton) (collectively, the Defendants), on Sinn's claims relating to his employment and the food he is served while incarcerated.

We affirm.

ISSUE

Sinn purports to raise several issues on appeal, which we consolidate and restate as the following single issue: Whether the trial court erred in granting summary judgment in favor of the Defendants.

FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Sinn has failed to provide us with the facts that support his argument on appeal. What we do know is that Sinn, a prison inmate, and the individually-named defendants all worked for PEN Products at one time or another. "PEN" is an acronym for "Prison Enterprises Network"; PEN Products is a division of the Indiana Department of Correction, and its mission, in part, is "[t]o employ offenders in meaningful jobs, to provide them with a work ethic and job skills." *See* PEN Products, available at <http://www.in.gov/indcorrection/penproducts/> (last visited May 7, 2008). Among other ventures, PEN Products provides food service at some DOC facilities. Sinn worked in food service for PEN Products until he was fired in January of 2004.

On August 24, 2005, Sinn filed a Complaint against the Defendants, alleging both state and federal claims. Sinn's claims related both to losing his job with PEN Products and to the food he is being served while incarcerated. The suit was eventually removed to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana. On June 6, 2006, the federal court granted summary judgment in favor of the Defendants on Sinn's federal claims and remanded the remaining state law claims to the Henry Superior Court. On May 23, 2007, the Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment on the remaining claims. On October 2, 2007, the trial court granted the Defendants' motion as to all of the Defendants on all of Sinn's claims.

Sinn now appeals.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION

On appeal, Sinn purports to argue that the trial court erred in granting summary judgment in favor of all of the Defendants on all of his state law claims. However, as mentioned above, he has failed to direct us to any facts that would support his argument. It is not our job to dig those facts up for him. More importantly, Sinn has failed to provide any rational argument beyond his general contention that the trial court got it wrong in this case. He has neglected to even tell us what his legal claims against the Defendants are, other than a brief mention of a "medically prescribed diet." (Appellant's Br. p. 7). As always, we appreciate the State's effort to respond to offender litigation, but it is neither the appellee's role nor ours to make a case for an appellant who has made such a woefully inadequate submission. Indiana Appellate Rule 46(A)(8)(a) requires an appellant to support his contentions with cogent reasoning. Sinn has failed to do so. As such, he has waived any

argument he may have had that the trial court erred in granting summary judgment in favor of the Defendants. *See In re K.B.*, 793 N.E.2d 1191, 1198 n.4 (Ind. Ct. App. 2003).

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, we conclude that Sinn has waived his arguments on appeal by failing to support them with cogent reasoning.

Affirmed.

BAKER, C.J., and ROBB, J., concur.